

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action of August 20, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 35-53 remain in this application. Claims 1-34 were previously canceled.

Claims 35-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 5,911,776 to Guck in view of U.S. patent no. 5,557,722 to DeRose et al. (“DeRose”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The action alleges that Guck discloses all the elements of independent claim 35, but for the formats for a document being styles sheets. To overcome this deficiency, the action relies on DeRose.

As amended, claim 35 calls for interrogating the output device to determine a set of capabilities of the output device; selecting one of a plurality of style sheets based upon the set of capabilities of the output device determined by interrogating the output device; and formatting the document for presentation on the output device using the selected style sheet. The action alleges that Guck shows determining a set of capabilities of the output device and selecting a format based upon the set of capabilities of the output device. While applicants’ disagree with the action’s characterization, to clarify the claim 35 invention, applicants have amended the claim to recite the step of “interrogating the output device to determine a set of capabilities of the output device” and to recite explicitly, rather than implicitly, that the step of selecting is based upon the set of capabilities of the output device *determined by interrogating the output device*. Nowhere does Guck teach or suggest interrogating an output device to determine its capabilities and selecting a format or selecting a format based upon the set of capabilities of the output device determined by interrogating the output device.

Guck describes a system and method in which a “source document can be created and then published in any specific format to multiple numbers of and type[s] of receiving appliances.” Guck, abstract, lines 11-13. According to Guck, the user can create a source file and one or more associated shadow files, which each point to the source file and a converter. Each converter and shadow file is dedicated to a particular output format. The converter takes the content of the source file and when requested by a requester client, converts the source file into

the particular output format. *Guck*, col. 4, lines 40-54. More particularly, a user decides which formats he would like his original (source) document to be available in and creates a shadow file for each desired format. As set forth in *Guck* at col. 7, lines 39-42,

the user now has the option to use the present system to describe all of its possible future needs and thus he can utilize the database 58 in Server 50 in order to create many different types of shadow files which relate to each of the possible different formats that might be required.

(Emphasis added). As represented in step H of Fig. 4, of *Guck*, when a user desires a particular file in a particular format, the user client or requestor asks for the content of the appropriate file. Then, the shadow file fetches the content of its source file and calls on its converter to transform the content of the source file (input content) into output content which is routed through the shadow file to the requestor. *Guck*, Fig. 4 and col. 16, lines 45-60. The output content delivered to the requestor is the desired content in the requested format.

From the above description, it is abundantly clear that *Guck* in no way interrogates an output device to determine a set of capabilities of the output device or selects a format based upon the set of capabilities of the output device determined by interrogating the output device. In contrast, according to *Guck* the user when creating the source file, creates the desired shadow files corresponding to different output formats and then when a requestor or client desires a particular file in a particular format, the requestor calls for the shadow file, which then starts the process of converting the source file to the desired output format to be routed to the requestor or client. Thus, at the time of creating the shadow file, no output device has even been identified much less interrogated. Moreover, when the output device has been identified, the requestor or client calls for the desired output content in a particular format. Notably, the required conversion parameters have already been established when the output device is ultimately identified and the desired format requested.

DeRose does not overcome the aforementioned deficiencies of *Guck*. Thus, the combination of *Guck* and DeRose, even if proper, does not result in the claim 35 invention. Independent claim 42 calls for, among other features, interrogating the output device to determine a set of capabilities of the output device; and generating a selected style sheet based upon the set of capabilities of the output device determined by interrogating the output device

using the layout generator. Independent claim 48 calls for, among other features, interrogating the output device to determine a set of capabilities of the output device; and based upon the set of capabilities of the output device determined by interrogating the output device, generating a style sheet. Thus, for substantially the same reasons as set forth with respect to claim 35, the combination of Guck and DeRose, even if proper, does not result in the invention of claims 42 and 48.

Claims 36-41, 43-47 and 49-53, which ultimately depend from claims 35, 42 and 48, respectively are patentably distinct from the combination of Guck and DeRose for the same reasons as their ultimate base claim and further in view of the additional advantageous features recited therein. For example, the action has failed to identify a teaching or suggestion of a layout generator as recited in claim 36. The action admits that neither Guck nor DeRose explicitly discloses a layout generator, yet fails to clearly articulate how the combination provides such a feature. Applicants note that a number of other claims call for a layout generator including independent claims 42 and 48.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: October 15, 2004

By:


Gary D. Fedorochko
Registration No. 35,509

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001

GDF:lab